

RENEWAL NOV DUE

No. 164 JUNE 1982

Spearhead

35p



THE SPIRIT OF THE MARINES VERSUS THE SPIRIT OF WESTMINSTER

FALKLANDS
COMMENT
(page 4)

Nationalist comment

WHAT WE THINK

on the month's news

EEC lets us down

The Falklands crisis has done us the service of reminding us who are our real friends and who are not. Only with great difficulty have we persuaded the EEC to keep up sanctions against Argentina, and it is probable that to do this we will have to pay a heavy price. At the same time we have been condemned right across the board by the EEC nations for our counter-invasion of the Falklands — condemned for taking back our own territory!

Australia and New Zealand, by contrast, have given their full co-operation with sanctions and New Zealand, in addition, has offered a frigate to help replace one of our own sent to join the task force in the South Atlantic — and this is despite the meagre loyalty Britain has shown those countries in recent years.

The main stumbling block in the renewal of sanctions among the Common Market countries was Italy, and for the reason

of that country's strong ethnic ties with Argentina (nearly half the Argentines are of Italian stock).

It all just goes to show how fragile and unnatural the unity of Europe is and how, when the crunch comes, the ties of flesh and blood between the European nations and their kinfolk across the oceans mean more than the artificial ties of the EEC.

Why not get out?

Also last month the Common Market countries voted to institute an 11 per-cent rise in farm prices — much against Britain's wishes. This broke a tradition of some years' standing by which major members like ourselves were able to use their veto to stop such moves when they were considered detrimental to national interests. In this case the other Market members did not permit a British veto and the price rise was bulldozed through.

Our own Government of course is incensed by this action and is bitterly complaining that it was 'stabbed in the back' by Britain's Market partners. Our Minister of Agriculture Peter Walker described the attitude of some of his EEC counterparts as 'cynical, incoherent and ridiculous.'

We have no sympathy with Mr. Walker or with the Government. If you decide to be a member of a club, you abide by the rules favoured by the majority of other members of that club. If you do not like these rules, you should not have been in the club in the first place — or at least you can now get out.

Years ago, when the pro-Marketeers were trumpeting how marvellous it would be for Britain when we joined the EEC, we warned that British membership would be a



PETER WALKER
His veto on farm prices ignored

SPEARHEAD

No. 164 JUNE 1982

Seacroft, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex

Editor: John Tyndall

Spearhead exists to reflect a cross-section of contemporary British nationalist opinion. It is privately published by its founder and is independent of all political parties and groups.

Unless specifically stated to the contrary, the views expressed in signed articles or letters are the sole responsibility of their authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Editor or the policies of any political organisations *Spearhead* may support editorially.

The appearance of an advertisement in *Spearhead* is not necessarily indicative that the Editor has any knowledge of, interest in or support for the product, service, organisation or function advertised.

Spearhead welcomes enquiries from potential advertisers, to whom rates will be sent on request. Advertising matter, accompanied by pre-payment, must be submitted at least one month prior to the publishing date (normally the first day of each month) of the issue for which the advertisement is intended. The Editor reserves the right to refuse to publish advertisements submitted.

The Editor is pleased to receive from readers manuscripts of articles for possible publication which should normally be not longer than 1,250 words and typed in double-spacing. No payment is made for articles published, which become *Spearhead* copyright unless authors specifically request otherwise at the time they submit their manuscripts. The Editor reserves the right to shorten or otherwise amend articles accepted for publication should shortage of space or editorial judgment require such alteration to be made.

Those wishing to re-print *Spearhead* articles must first gain the permission of the Editor and undertake to include with the re-printed matter the author's name and the name and address of *Spearhead*.

disaster for this country. They ignored our warnings and pressed ahead with joining. Now the chickens are coming home to roost and they are yelping like stuck pigs when they find that things in the Market are not going the way they wanted.

There is now only one honourable thing for our rulers to do — admit that they made a big mistake in supporting British entry into the Common Market and get cracking to pull us out.

BBC humbug

Surprise! Surprise! The BBC has adopted an attitude over the Falklands crisis which the Government finds 'unpatriotic'. Really, did the Government ever expect anything else?

For a long time we have warned against the traitors and subversives who seem to predominate among programme makers of the so-called 'British' Broadcasting Corporation, but our warnings were ignored in many quarters. Now, it seems, even the Government is waking up to the facts.

In the debate concerning the attitude of the BBC over the Falklands two very interesting comments have been made.

One came from BBC Radio Managing Editor Richard Francis, who said that the Corporation was not in the game of patriotism but was concerned with sticking to the truth, which, he said, was always the best propaganda.

Mr. Francis has got to be joking. In our experience — that is to say the experience of British Nationalists — there is scarcely any organisation in the land which has a worse record when it comes to the truth than the BBC. For many years we have been on the receiving end of an endless stream of lies churned out by that body. For it now to set itself up as a paragon of honesty is simply laughable.

The other comment worth remarking upon came from HRH Prince Charles, who in reference to the Government's criticisms of the BBC stated that it was dangerous when Governments started to try to 'gag' broadcasting services, whose freedom was an essential part of democracy.

Such a statement is pure hogwash. Just who elects these mandarins of the broadcasting world and gives them their power? Do the people elect them? To whom are they responsible? Is it the people? The answer to both questions is clearly No! The people have no control over broadcasters at all; they are an oligarchy wielding tremendous power over society and enjoying special privileges all of their own. If some control is not to be exercised over them from some quarter, then just what limit is there to the power that they possess? Is Government control over the broadcasting media worse than control by the broadcasters over the broadcasting media? Government is at least in the final analysis answerable to the electorate; the broadcasters, it seems, should be answerable to no-one.

The time is long overdue for broadcasting in this country to be made an instrument of the nation and not the exclusive preserve of a seemingly self-perpetuating elite remote from the nation and often, as has recently been highlighted, against the nation. We pay for the BBC by our TV and radio licence fees. It is about time that it

started to represent us, the British people.

It is, after all, called the British Broadcasting Corporation, isn't it?

Race and intelligence

A recent report in the scientific journal Nature has caused great consternation. The report is based on a study by Dr. Richard Lynn, of the New University of Ulster, of the IQ performances of the world's various national, ethnic and religious groups, and it gives no comfort to those who have maintained that mental aptitudes among the world's peoples are equal.

On a national basis, the Japanese come out on top with an average IQ of 111 among Japanese children. This is some way higher than among American children — 15 points in fact — and the children of Britain and other 'Protestant' European countries, who come next in the order of IQ. Below the latter are the children of the 'Catholic' European countries and below them the Negro nations.

And above the whole lot are the Jews, who are recorded as having an IQ average of 116.

These facts and figures are certainly interesting but they fail to take certain things into account.

The IQ averages among 'British' and 'American' children are gleaned from all ethnic groups in Britain and the United States, including of course Blacks. In the United States one must add to these the large numbers of children of Hispanic descent, thus distorting the true picture. That 'Americans' on average are found to be of lower IQ than Japanese is hardly surprising in these circumstances. In fact IQ tests in the US some years ago which were broken down into ethnic groups established that, while children of Japanese and Chinese origin scored higher on average than White children, they scored slightly lower than children descended from North European immigrants. It was only when the term 'White' was taken to include Italian, Greek and other non-Nordic ethnic groups that the White average dropped below the Japanese and Chinese average.

In IQ tests conducted among American servicemen in World War I and detailed in Lothrop Stoddard's The Revolt against civilisation it was found that the highest scores were achieved by those of British descent and the next highest by those from other North European groups.

It is possible that even North European groups still score slightly lower than Jews, and this seems to be borne out by the comparisons between Jews and 'Protestant' European countries where there are almost no Blacks in the population. This could be accountable, as the report suggests, by the fact that certain Jewish customs encourage

a constant upbreeding in the population. For instance, Rabbis, who are usually of the highest intelligence, as a rule have very large families. In contrast, many of the most intelligent Catholics enter the priesthood and remain celibate.

Some may take the findings of this report as proof that the Jews stand at the top of the hierarchy of the world's races but that would be a false assumption. IQ tests are but one measure of mental aptitude; they do not necessarily indicate creative ability. The Jews have produced few great creative artists. They can claim perhaps one great composer in Mendelsohn, one great poet in Heine, and that is about all. There has never been a Jewish Shakespeare, a Jewish Goethe, a Jewish Wren, a Jewish Leonardo or a Jewish Dostoevsky.

And when we look at the great scientific and technical inventions that have improved the life of mankind we will find a predominance of Anglo-Saxon-Celtic and German names among the creators.

On the field of war, the Jewish race has so far proved only that it can defeat Egyptians and other Arab nationalities. Sir John Monash, an Australian Jew, was among the most competent commanders of the British Imperial forces in 1914-18. With this exception, the list of Jewish soldiers who have distinguished themselves in action against the leading fighting races of the world is a pretty bare one.

Timely statement

Lord Denning, Master of the Rolls, has done the nation a great service by his outspoken comments about the British jury system, made recently in his book What next the law?

Lord Denning was particularly scathing towards the rule by which the defendant is given the right to change the composition of the jury if he or she feels that some of the members may be 'prejudiced'.

Lord Denning cited as an example of the abuses of this system the way in which coloured defendants in the Bristol riots trial repeatedly objected to jurors until the point was reached when they were tried by a largely coloured jury. The result, as everyone knows, was a series of acquittals and ridiculously light sentences. Said Lord Denning: "The English are no longer a homogeneous race; they are White and Black, Coloured and Brown. They no longer share the same standards of conduct." On these grounds, he said, not all citizens are now qualified enough to serve on juries.

Lord Denning would now no doubt feel that his point has had extra strong backing by the farce of the Terry May 'trial', which took place after the book was written, and in which a predominantly coloured jury threw all the murder charges out.

The spirit of the Marines



THE ROYAL MARINES:
Courage,
Toughness,
Patriotism.

SPEARHEAD this month salutes our magnificent fighting men who have just staged a counter-invasion of the Falkland Islands and now look poised to achieve a heroic victory over the Argentine forces there. They represent all that is best in the British race and have gladdened our hearts with their demonstration of guts, spirit and skill.

This fine performance on the military front, however, has done nothing to salvage the reputations of those who have represented Britain on the political front, and it does not render invalid the analysis of the situation which we gave in these columns last month.

From the start, the Thatcher Government has had to contend in its handling of the Falklands crisis with pressures from two opposite quarters. On the one hand, there has been the healthy tide of public opinion which recognises the issue for what it is: a flagrant act of aggression against British territory and British people which cannot be allowed and which must be countered, when all else has failed, by force. One must add to this the pressure from service chiefs, who have known that if military action to retake the Falklands was to be mounted, numerous factors — climatic, psychological and logistical ones being in the forefront — dictate that it should be done without delay. This pressure has been enforced by Tory back-benchers who quite rightly recognise that the credibility of the Government in the eyes of the electorate would have sunk to zero if it had funk'd out of this challenge as it and its predecessors have funk'd out of every other challenge, domestic and international, during the past two or three decades.

Mrs. Thatcher does not want to be embarrassed by resignations, either from the military, naval or air top brass or from any substantial number of MPs in her own party. She has committed the task force to sail to the South Atlantic at enormous cost; to order it home again in any circumstances

other than victory or a total Argentine climb-down would be ludicrous and be seen to be so.

The pressures from the other quarter hardly need spelling out: they come from the alliance of dripping wet liberal consciences in politics, press and church and hard-headed interests, political and commercial, in this country and around the world which stand in some way to lose by an Argentine defeat. Among the latter are large sections of the international banking community, which is scared stiff of the collapse of the Peso, numerous trading interests who fear the loss of contracts, not only in Argentina itself but throughout Latin America, and powerful political pressure groups worried that if President Galtieri falls he may be replaced by a regime much more difficult to deal with — possibly even a Communist one.

DUTY OF GOVERNMENT

In situations such as these, it is of course the duty of any proper national government to act solely in consideration of the overall national interest and not to be influenced by 'pressures' from whichever quarter they come. That national interest has to be measured, not only in terms of the protection of concrete material assets, whether these be economic or strategical, but also of national honour and respect — self-respect as much as respect earned abroad.

Every consideration of the national interest determines that the Falklands must not only be retaken with all possible speed but resolutely preserved as a British possession for all time — with the world left in no doubt as to our position and intention in this regard. The seas around the Falklands are a probable source of great wealth in oil and certainly in fish; the islands are of immense strategic importance in the assertion of any future British claims to a share in

the vast mineral wealth of the Antarctic; the islanders are British in race and proudly and passionately British in loyalty and sentiment, and they have a right to decide that British they will remain.

These considerations apart, any nation which, having suffered an invasion of its territory, does not take prompt military action to recover that territory — the timing of such action being determined solely by military criteria — will for the foreseeable future not only be held by the rest of humanity in total contempt but will suffer a loss to its own pride and self-esteem that will have appalling consequences in every area of national life.

And such contempt and loss of pride will be scarcely less if that nation, while repossessing its territory for the short term, gives any acknowledgement that that possession is negotiable in the longer term. In such circumstances the question might legitimately be asked: for what purpose were many men's lives risked, and inevitably some men's lives sacrificed, if the intention was at any time in the future to give away the fruits of their victory? What will the widows, parents and children of those who have fallen in the Falklands battle think of a Government which played with the lives of their dearest ones in such a way?

MOTIVE BEHIND ACTION

These are the principles which should underly our action over the Falklands, but it is certain that the order recently given to invade the islands — and the subsequent bold military operations that have occurred — were influenced by one factor and one factor alone.

Not the principles we have stated — not those by any stretch of imagination — but solely the considerations of party politics. Mrs. Thatcher's Government has made the decision that of the two sets of pressures being applied against it that of British public opinion, with all that that portends for future elections, plus pressure from party back benches and service chiefs, is in immediate terms greater than that coming from the opposite direction. That, and that only, has imbued the Government with the resolve to do what is right over the Falklands.

Everything that has happened over the past month has underlined this analysis. When the invasion of the Falklands by the Argentine first occurred, the various political factions had not had time to crystallise their thoughts or mobilise their battalions; reaction was therefore, in a sort of way, instinctive. The task force was immediately assembled

Contd. on next page

versus the spirit of Westminster



THATCHER



PYM



CARRINGTON



FOOT

Wetness, compromise, surrender

and given orders to sail, and the Government declared that there could be no solution to the issue which did not incorporate the restoration of British administration and which did not recognise the right to self-determination of the Falklanders.

But as the weeks went by the forces of internationalism, pacifism, defeatism and downright treason that are today rampant throughout British life began to organise themselves and feel their strength. Allied to them of course was the usual cavalcade of self-righteous little prigs of politics and pulpit who sensed a golden opportunity to bare their humanitarian little hearts once again before the grandstand of 'liberal' opinion. The nauseous whining of this chorus became louder with every news bulletin that reported successful action by our troops and airmen. In due course the sages of *The Guardian* and *The Observer* and their disciples in the more moronically orientated newspapers worked out their rationale for surrender and spewed forth their message in their respective agony columns. Rentacrowd, headed by Tony Benn and Judith Hart, took to the London Streets and presented to the Argentine Junta the propaganda photographs for which it had so hopefully prayed. The hypocrisy of this common cause between Britain's lefties and a Fascist military dictatorship surprised only the simple-minded. Wherever and whenever Britain's interests and honour are at stake, these people can be relied upon with mathematical certainty to support the other side. They breathe sedition and betrayal as naturally as a normal man breathes air. The predictability of their behaviour did not lessen the foul stench that emanated from their presence; on the contrary, it merely

hardened the wish that when the guns of Britain's units in the South Atlantic were ordered to open up on Britain's enemies in that area these enemies at home might be transported there and planted right in the line of fire alongside those whose cause they were striving so hard to help.

In the face of this fifth column at home, aligned to pressures on the international scene, the Thatcher Government displayed the colours we have come to expect of it from all its past performances. It crawled abjectly around the capitals of the world and throughout the chambers of the United Nations, trying to maintain the ridiculous charade of 'negotiation' over an issue which quite patently was non-negotiable. As in Northern Ireland for many years, it threw up a smoke-screen consisting of mountains of waffle designed to create the impression that there was somehow a 'middle way' between victory and surrender. Every little armchair diplomat, as well as the professionals in the game, enjoyed the pastime of drawing up blueprints for peace which, examined in the clear light of day, were at best palpable nonsense and at worst a gross insult to the men in the South Atlantic risking their lives for Queen and Country. They all pointed one way — to a climb-down from the principle that the Falklands were British territory and had to be restored as such by any means necessary — peaceful if possible but violent if not.

OPTIONS SIMPLE

But what were the peaceful options? From the start, they were short and simple. As soon as it had been clearly indicated to the Argentine Junta that we were sending an

Falklands crisis reveals split in British character

invasion force to liberate the Falklands, the Junta should have been given one straight warning: get out in seven days or else! Once that warning had been ignored, all further diplomatic activity should have been abandoned and the troops sent in as soon as they were ready and the weather favourable.

By its very act of permitting negotiations to go beyond this point, the Government demonstrated to the world that it — as distinct from the task force — was terrified out of its wits of a fight. The world has a way of noting these things, and we can be quite sure that this exhibition of quivering has been duly noted — not least in Moscow.

But this has not been all. The next thing we heard was that the Government had retreated even from the exceedingly watery conditions that it had stated previously. Instead of the automatic right of self-determination of the Falklanders, those Falklanders' feelings were merely "to be taken into account". Instead of the restoration of British rule over the Falklands, we would consider placing them under mandate by the United Nations. As another concession, it was announced that we did not necessarily regard the Falklands as being ours "for ever".

The carrier of these extraordinary tidings was the new Foreign Secretary, Mr. Pym, just about as uninspiring figure as Britain has ever sent forth to do business in the councils of the world — and that is really saying something!

We could hardly believe our ears when we heard of these proposals. It was as if the scenario had been transported to a world of fantasy. You would think that the task force in the South Atlantic was in deep trouble and the Argentines poised for victory. President Galtieri was laying down the law and making all the conditions and HM Government was making concession after concession. In fact, apart from the tragic episode of HMS Sheffield, the Argentinian forces were getting the worst of it on all fronts. It had been quite clearly proved already that in war capability the Argies just were not in the same league as our men. We

Contd. on page 12

It splits our camp

**says
RAY HILL**

THE RISE OF 'STRASSERISM' is worrying many Nationalists in Britain today and rightly so. This manifestation of what is sometimes called Nationalist Marxism is much more dangerous than the youthful infatuation with Socialism that many of us, including the writer of this article, have experienced.

The danger of Strasserism lies in its seductive appeal to working class youth. I should know because I write as a man of impeccable working class origin and when I hear the Strasserite telling the young nationalist that it is mainly working class people who are suffering from the results of alien immigration I know that what he is saying is no more than the truth. When he tells them that their forefathers were treated as badly as any black slave, having to earn their daily bread working in mills and coal-mines when they were a mere nine or ten years old, I know that this too is true. When it is pointed out that flogging native troops in the Indian Army was forbidden at a time when British servicemen were still subject to that punishment in that same army, then my blood boils and I curse the liberal establishment of that day and I realise myself how easy it would be to rationalise the whole thing on the basis of class, as did Karl Marx.

SOCIALISM TO NATIONALISM

I graduated to Nationalism from Socialism. If Strasserism is not defeated and eradicated from our thinking then I very much fear that literally thousands of our youth will end up travelling in the opposite direction. Strasserism creates a parallel, albeit a false one, between white working class youth and first and subsequent generation black immigrants. Both blame their positions on some form of 'exploitation', both feel that they are 'discriminated' against and both blame the 'upper class' for their plight. Having been fed this baloney by those who ought to know better, many a

white working class youngster is going to progress to the idea that the black working class youngster is his natural ally against this 'upper class'.

During last year's inner city riots the word went around Leicester that "Ray Hill was going to get sorted out" by a mob of blacks. My house is less than a mile from the scene of the fiercest rioting. At about ten o'clock on the worst night of the riots there was a knock on my door and I found a dozen or so white working class youths, some of whom I didn't even know, who insisted upon stationing themselves in my front room to guard me, my wife and my family. Needless to say I was grateful and not a little touched by their concern. My wife made tea for these fine lads and during conversation one of them said to me words to the following effect: "Why do they bother people like us? Why smash up our streets and break our windows? We didn't bring them here. If they would go and smash up Stoneygate (an upper middle class area) I would feel like helping them."

I probed this young man's thinking and, so far as it went, it did contain elements of logic. He pointed out that most of the people in Stoneygate originated in the area in which I now live. They had consistently voted Lib/Lab/Con, had ignored Nationalist warnings and, when the crunch came, had bought themselves out of it. He added that whenever the local rag reported "skinhead thugs" causing trouble with innocent black muggers, the letters page would for the next day or so be full of outraged liberal protests from Stoneygate. It was his conclusion that a good dose of black rioting was just what the doctor ordered for the citizens of Stoneygate.

I am happy to say that I have since spent quite a lot of time with this particular young man and he has discarded his Bolshevik/Strasserite attitude towards his fellow Britons, no matter where they reside.

He was, of course, quite right in saying that many of the people to whom he referred had "bought themselves out" of the multi-racial cesspit that inner city Leicester has become. I pointed out to him that the only reason that I had not done so was that, with three young children, I simply do not have the money. If I were to win the pools or be left a few thousand, I would certainly move, perhaps even to Stoneygate. Would he then suggest that my family and I deserve to be subjected to the tender mercies of rioting blacks? Gradually I got through to him, thank God.

For any Nationalist movement that is concerned merely with numbers and short-

term advantage, Strasserism is an obvious choice. It is simplistic in the extreme; it is, to a large extent, supported by establishment media and even by some establishment politicians; and it feeds upon the natural dissatisfaction of many of our young people.

Several months ago I wrote an article for *Spearhead* the purpose of which was to analyse a previous article which had appeared in the *Sunday Times*. The *Sunday Times* article had "moved" a working class housing estate, Braunstone, about seven miles in order to be able to describe it as 'inner city' and to give the impression that Braunstone, which is almost entirely white, was sharing in the massive inner city grants programme. The ramifications of the article went much further of course. It led the reader to believe that the inner city problems were completely multi-racial and therefore must be 'economic'. I don't see why the *Sunday Times* had to bother; they could have just left it to the National Front, for such a conclusion is bound to grow from the Strasserism at present being promoted by that organisation.

SPLITS AND DIVIDES

Strasserism divides and splits our already insufficient manpower. It preaches hatred of a section of our own people. Such hatred is the very antithesis of true Nationalism. It alienates people who could, and would, give us support in financial and organisational fields and it plays right into the hands of our enemies, who must chortle with delight at the success of their 'divide and rule' strategy.

Strasserism is a reaction — an absolutely un-healthy reaction but nevertheless a reaction — against the other extreme of the Nationalist wing which has regarded the working class element as mere cannon-fodder. Class hatred is stupid whether it be hatred of the middle and upper classes by Strasserites or hatred and contempt of the working class by Tory 'Nationalists'.

I have been host in my house to Nationalists from all sorts of backgrounds: professional men, lawyers and doctors, on one occasion an aristocrat and on many occasions working class lads from the East End. I regard all of them as my friends and if any of them were ever to judge me on my accent, my income group or my formal education (or lack of it) I would find it both hurtful and offensive. We Nationalists have a right to judge our fellow Nationalists by one criteria only and that is our respective contributions to Nationalism.

Class warfare has no place in Nationalism and class warfare is precisely what Strasserism advocates. It must be defeated.

YOUNG NATIONALIST

Read *Young Nationalist* the paper for youth published on behalf of the Youth Section of the British National Party. Send 20p for sample copy to: 16 Vale Lodge, Perry Vale, London S.E.23.

Our magazine, though it believes in racial differences, opposes race-hatred. All those who oppose multi-racialism should attack the politicians who promote it, not the immigrants, who are merely its victims.

It is remote from the real world

says
JOHN TYNDALL

THERE ARE strangely close parallels between left-wing Nationalism — sometimes referred to as 'Strasserism' — and the Trotskyite left which operates within the world Communist movement.

Both base their doctrines on one central idea: that those making the 'great' revolutions — in the case of Communism the Revolution in Russia in 1917 and in the case of Nationalism the revolutions in Italy in 1922, in Spain in 1939 but pre-eminently in Germany in 1933 — allowed the original revolutionary ideals to be betrayed in the later development of the new revolutionary order.

Granted, Trotskyite folklore leaves the reputation of the first revolutionary leader, Lenin, untarnished, and concentrates its hatred on Lenin's successor Stalin, who, it claims, steered the revolution off course after Lenin's death. On the other hand, Trotsky's counterparts in the Nationalist camp direct their fire at the original leaders of the successful Nationalist revolutions in Europe, namely Mussolini, Franco and Hitler. But that is a detail. The basically common picture is not altered. The men who made Communism, on the one hand, and Nationalism, on the other hand, powerful are branded as deviationists by those who today represent the left wing in the two camps.

In what way did they deviate? From the two brands of parrot the cry is similar: they made compromises and alliances with the forces of reaction. Stalin adopted Nationalism and 'anti-semitism' and turned the Soviet state into a Bonapartist dictatorship with himself as a cult figure — all concepts which had no place in the proletarian-internationalist doctrines which lay at the centre of the original revolutionary movement. Mussolini, Franco and Hitler did deals with conservative, 'bourgeois' and big business interests in their respective countries in the process of achieving and keeping power. This was in violation of the original 'National Socialist' ideas of those who first coined that term and who intended that the Socialist, just as much as the Nationalist, aspect of their programme should be taken literally.

In this way Stalin among Communists and Mussolini, Franco and Hitler among Nationalists are conveniently labelled as belonging to the 'right wing' of their respective movements and therefore renegades to the true revolutionary faith.


NEITHER RIGHT NOR LEFT

But of course this is nonsense. Neither Mussolini, Franco nor Hitler were 'right wing' or 'left wing'. Nor were any of them totally

'revolutionary' or 'reactionary' or committed to 'Socialism' or 'Capitalism'. They were all men who lived in the real world of politics and power. Their programmes were in fact a combination of both revolution and reaction, as all truly effective political programmes have to be. Of course they entered into alliance with 'reactionary' forces in the making of their respective regimes and in the rebuilding of their respective countries — for the very good reason that such forces represented elements in the power structures of those countries which could not simply be

revolutionary is the man who wants to destroy and sweep away only those traditional institutions that serve no good purpose and positively hamper future national development; the revolutionary who wants to destroy and sweep away everything with roots in the past has never built, and will never build, anything.

And every revolutionary who wants to win and hold power and thence to build from that position of power has to come to some sort of terms with the forces that represent power in the country in which he



HITLER



STALIN

Political realists, both

wished away. In the case of Italy and Spain the Catholic Church represented the most significant of these forces, while in that of Germany it was the Prussian landowning military caste and the titans of the industrial Ruhr. Anyone who imagined that he could make revolutions in the countries in question in the face of the united enmity of these great institutions was living in a political fairyland.

Besides, those who constantly use the word 'reaction' in a derogatory sense and give no place to forces of conservatism and tradition in the rebuilding of a country are out of step with fact and with history. Not everything that is old and established is necessarily bad. The constructive revo-

operates. He cannot declare war on all of them at one and the same time even if he wanted to. What he has to decide is which forces represent irreconcilable obstacles to his constructive aims and which forces do not. The weight of the latter must then be directed, by intelligent politics, against the former. This inevitably involves some compromises in the eyes of those ideological purists in his own party who, from the safety of their typewriters, draw up pretty blueprints for the ideal society but who never have to grapple with the problems of government.

Stalin, from his somewhat different position, nevertheless had to secure the

Contd. overleaf

REMOTE FROM REAL WORLD

(Contd. from prev. page)

survival of his state and his country in the real world, just as Mussolini, Franco and Hitler did. He recognised what the Trotsky gang would not recognise: that promoting international revolution without a strong power base in Russia was a pipe dream. Russia first had to be made industrially and militarily powerful. While the methods he employed to bring this about were inhuman and barbarous, they were probably the only methods by which he could ever have succeeded — and certainly had he not gone some of the way towards reaching his objectives in these regards Russia, and with it Communism, would have been crushed by the invading German armies in 1941 and 1942.

In pursuit of this mammoth programme, Stalin was forced to turn Russia into an autocracy with himself holding absolute power. He also found that in order to mobilise the Russian people it was necessary to resurrect Russian Nationalism — a policy without which, in addition, he probably could not have created, or retained the loyalty of, the Soviet military machine. As he proceeded, Stalin found that at the centre of the forces opposed to him was the international Jewish element that had remained strong since the Revolution. His purges of his opponents inevitably attained the dimensions of a 'pogrom' — as happens in every state where there is a serious attempt to grapple with internal subversion and the agents of that subversion are in due course spotlighted and removed.

REALISTS

Where Stalin in his sphere, and Mussolini, Franco and Hitler in theirs, dissatisfied some of those who had been their original allies was in fact that they, unlike the latter, were political realists who recognised the limitations of pure ideology in the world of human action. This is not to say that they felt bound by no principles of ideology at all — this was certainly not the case with the Fascist and National Socialist leaders; it is only to stress that they had the faculty for understanding what was essential in the ideological foundations of their movements and what was inessential.

In every revolutionary movement that has arisen in modern history there have been three main elements: first the intellectual and political theorist, who revels in the rôle of drawing up intricate 'programmes' to cover every aspect of the life of society and to whom ideological 'correctness' (his own of course) is paramount in all things; secondly the pure man of action, who carries on his travels the very barest ideological baggage; thirdly the combination of theoretician and man of action, who marries theory with practice in that final synthesis that is the

foundation of all effective politics.

In the Nazi Party of Germany, Rosenberg, Feder, Eckhart and Otto Strasser were prominent examples of the first type and Goering, Epp, Rohm and Heydrich archetypes of the second, with Goebbels and Gregor Strasser combining some of the attributes of both. In Hitler, however, there was the supreme realisation of the two faculties developed to the highest degree. Also in Hitler was the faculty for distilling what was essential in the realm of ideology from the mass of the inessential, and consequently never allowing the latter to become an end in itself but using or discarding it according to requirements of circumstances.

ORIGIN OF NATIONAL SOCIALIST'

When Hitler was building up his movement in its formative years, he adopted for it the name 'National Socialist'. There was a great deal of logic in this choice; the term 'Socialist' at that time embodied the hopes of many millions for a better society and it is probable that without it the Hitler movement would not have had the same mass appeal — particularly to the hungry of Germany.

Had the use of the term involved any fundamental deception of the German people by being contrary to the ultimate political, economic and social aims of Hitler, it would of course be permissible to say that such use was immoral. No-one, however, has been able to establish that this was the case. 'Socialist' is one of those words that can be made to mean almost anything that the user wants it to mean. Taking it in its widest application, we could say that anyone is a Socialist who recognises that society has an obligation to protect the welfare of all its members — leaving the question of the precise method of this protection open to an almost endless number of permutations, each able to justify being called 'Socialist'.

This, I believe, was certainly what was in the minds of the Nazis as they acknowledged the label themselves — and why not? Could they not claim that the benefits they achieved for the great mass of the German people in the years 1933-39, considering the industrial and scientific possibilities of the time, were proportionately far greater than anything that has been achieved by governments putting into practice 'Socialism' of the Marxist or Fabian variety?

The trouble lay in the fact that the Nazis inevitably attracted to their banner a number of individuals who imagined the adoption of the word 'Socialist' to mean something entirely different to what it was intended by Hitler to mean, and to believe that in it there was room for the sentiments of egalitarianism, envy and class war that underly the 'Socialism' of the left. They fully expected that when the day of victory for the movement came the landowning aristocracy would have its properties expro-

priated, the great industries of Germany handed over to 'workers' control' and the army 'proletarianised' and stripped of its ancient traditions, with promotion made on the basis of party loyalty and ideological rectitude rather than merit in the art of war.

Hitler and the prevailing caucus in the party recognised of course the nonsense of such ideas. In a debate on industry, the Führer once reminded his party colleagues that their movement was based on the leadership principle. The men, he said, who had built and maintained the great industries that had provided the foundations of German prosperity and industrial might had established their claim to leadership in those industries by the fact of their achievement — just as was accepted as being the case in the leadership of the party and state. If it was an absurdity to deprive the latter of its power and to devolve that power onto committees of people who had no comparable achievement to their record, so was it equally an absurdity to apply the same principle to industry. The leaders of industry would be expected to run their concerns in conformity with the interests of Germany; as long as this overall need was met, they, and not 'workers' committees', were the best judges of how to act.

BIOLOGICAL HIERARCHY

When it came to the question of the privileges of the aristocracy, it was clearly in keeping with the racial nationalist faith that these were justified as long as aristocracy represented a biological hierarchy within the nation and as long as any such privileges were counter-balanced by correspondingly special duties. The question in the years following 1933 was to what extent a real German aristocracy based on race corresponded to the existing aristocracy that had inherited the great estates of the old Junkers. Clearly, the two did not completely correspond and it was a long-term aim of the party to select and breed a new aristocratic caste that would be established on the basis of service to the nation in the era of national reconstruction and expansion that had begun in 1933 — for instance, the new lands that had been added to the Reich in the East by means of conquest would be given to those who had distinguished themselves the most among the conquerors. This, however, was a process that would require time, and in the meanwhile nothing would be achieved by the dispossession of the older aristocratic families merely on the basis that their wealth had been inherited. In due course the worthless elements would be weeded out and the best preserved, but this would not be a repudiation of aristocracy *per se*, only of those parts of the aristocracy that were no good. This did not satisfy the Nazi left, who, like their Bolshevik counterparts, wanted the whole institution destroyed.

Contd. on page 12

THE TASKS AHEAD

TO MY REPORT last month on the formation of the British National Party I gave the title 'A new era begins'. This was appropriate in more senses than just the forming of a new organisation and the adoption of a new party name. It signified the adoption of an entirely new approach to politics based on the strategic and tactical lessons that we have learned over the past decade.

In the 1970s Nationalists in Britain achieved much in the way of public impact and in the gaining of new adherents to the cause, yet at the end of that decade this achievement was not reflected in the existence of any firm organisational structure whereby the struggle could be continued effectively into the 1980s, let alone in any placing of the feet of Nationalists even on the bottom rungs of the ladder of political power.

The main thrust of our activities in the Seventies was a herculean effort to ascend this ladder by means of parliamentary and local government elections, with the object being to fight as many elections as possible over as wide an area of the country as possible. The net result of this activity was that many hundreds of thousands of pounds of money was expended and not one single seat either in parliament or local government won. In the General Election of May 1979, in which Nationalists mounted the biggest challenge ever mounted by any political movement in this country of similar complexion — the main Nationalist party at that time, the National Front, fighting 301 seats — the most successful candidate anywhere won a mere 7.6 per-cent of the poll.

The lesson to be learned from these results was abundantly clear: it is that the British public simply is not yet prepared or



**BRITISH
NATIONALISTS
ON THE
MARCH**
Important that
they chose right
direction

JOHN TYNDALL looks at the coming strategic and tactical aims of the British National Party

ready to give mass support to Nationalism.

In making such a statement, I should explain it in its proper context. It certainly does not mean that there is not a large part of the public that already holds certain Nationalist ideas; it means simply that the public *en masse* is not yet ready to give credibility to an organised Nationalist movement which exists outside the spectrum of orthodox party politics, which does not contain in its ranks any established or respected public figures, which is not given the stamp of approval by even the smallest part of the mass media and which therefore must employ methods to present its case to the people entirely different to those employed by politicians and parties with access to the conventional means of communication.

REQUIREMENTS FOR CHANGE

Two essential things are needed to remedy this situation:—

The first is that events, on the political, economic and social planes, continue to underline even further the inexorable process of deterioration of British society under the old parties, and thereby produce an ever

stronger realisation of the need for radical solutions and of the futility of support for conventional parties and politicians. In a nutshell, everything in the country must get worse before it can get better.

Secondly, a much more extensive and thorough programme for the education of British public opinion must be carried out. For this to be pursued effectively, Nationalists in this country must build a much more powerful, highly organised and sophisticated political machine than was at their disposal in the 1970s. It must be a political machine that has more money, more amenities, a much bigger and better apparatus of communication and propaganda and, above all, much stronger cadres of leadership at all levels.

The purpose of our party during the remainder of the 1980s will be to build such a political machine. During this phase of construction I do not envisage that any substantial resources will be devoted to the fighting of elections. The 1979 General Election established, and subsequent by-elections and local government elections have underlined, that electoral activity by Nationalists in the present political climate and with our present limitations of resources is an almost total waste of time. At best it achieves nothing; at worst it results in a sometimes permanent damaging of morale among people of good Nationalist material but not fully mature political outlook, who have not yet adjusted themselves to a realistic time-scale for the achievement of success.

Wise generalship in war has to take the factor of morale heavily into account just as it has to take into account factors of logistics. Nothing can be more crippling to the fighting spirit and will to victory of one's army than for the troops to be constantly given tactical objectives that at the time are hopelessly beyond their capacity and as a result of which, therefore, they are certain to suffer crushing defeats.

In a previous article I have stated that the position of Nationalists in British politics today is analogous to that of the British Army in 1940 after Dunkirk. We have been outmanoeuvred, outgunned, and outclassed in every aspect of battle. Clearly, a frontal counter-attack on the enemy in the foreseeable future is out of the question. We must recruit, train and equip massive new forces before that can ever be considered, and in the meantime must content ourselves on engaging the enemy in limited encounters where we can expect to achieve results that are worth the effort and risk.

From the outset we have opted to designate our new organisation as a political

Contd. overleaf

THE TASKS AHEAD

(Contd. from prev. page)

party. That is proper and right because ultimately it is only through a political party approach that our aims can succeed. Our objective must always remain the winning of political power for Nationalism. Nothing short of that objective has any use. We are not a 'pressure group', conceived with a view to influencing one of the established parties in the 'right' direction, because none of the established parties lends itself in the remotest way to that possibility. We can only ever put our principles and ideals into effect by means of our own party, and it is right that we start now as we expect to go on — by calling ourselves a party and settling for nothing less in the way of titles.

EMBRYO PARTY

This having been said, we must nevertheless recognise that for a number of years we are going to be a party in embryo rather than one in reality. Our function in this first phase is going to be less that of a party and more that of a combination of educational body and business. We must be an educational body in the sense that we must work to bring about a fundamental change in the political climate of this country, and this we can do only by a long and patient process of political education. We are a business in the sense that we must ensure in the future to lay down firm economic foundations for our political survival. We all must clearly have learned the lesson by now that the strength of our enemy is based on **money power**. While we cannot hope before victory to achieve the dimensions of money power enjoyed by the enemy, we can at least, by intelligent and provident management of our economic resources, build sufficient money power to guarantee our continued political existence and development.

Let us now examine in some more detail our task of education. This task divides itself naturally into two fields: first there are the tens of millions of ordinary voters; secondly there are the few thousands of influential people in those key sectors of the nation's life where most things are decided — society's natural political activists, organisers, communicators, educators and leaders.

In the first field there is already much going for us. In terms of broad sentiment, there is a strong consensus in favour of the things of which we are in favour. The majority of British people are still, albeit in a passive way, patriotic. They are not enamoured of left-wing ideas and they are growing increasingly impatient with the 'wetness' of so many of those politicians of the liberalistic 'centre'. They are with us, or at least turning our way, on Race and Immigration, the Common Market, Law and Order, Defence, Trade Unions and much else.

It is in the second field that we face the greatest problem, for it is in that field that we encounter the root of the national rot. The *elite* sections of British society are predominantly left-liberal and internationalist. And the most powerful institutions in the land are arrayed overwhelmingly on their side.

It is precisely because of this that the great reservoir of latent patriotism that resides in the ordinary voting masses never finds proper expression or representation in the great decisions of state. Those who control the levers of power ignore it up to the limit dictated by their own safety; beyond that limit they climb aboard it and ensure that it is directed down innocuous channels — best exemplified in the display of flags and pageantry at royal weddings and the like.

Wherever and whenever there is the danger that the masses might be disposed to entertain a fundamental change in political direction, this danger can be neutralised by the simple exercise of persuading them that those offering this change are somehow 'not credible' and that the same changes may be achieved by the placing of mass support behind other politicians who are granted 'credibility'. I need not reiterate the methods by which this was accomplished throughout the 1970s by those controlling the means of mass communication — those methods will be familiar to all Nationalists. As everyone knows, we simply did not have the means to combat them effectively because the vast majority of communicators and 'educators' were on the other side and nearly all the money and facilities were on the other side as well.

It follows that if we are to lay the foundations of any possible political success in the future we must establish a much stronger foothold among that minority section of the populace that is the guide and mentor of public opinion beyond, as well as providing the cadres of brains and talent likely to play the most influential roles in the shaping of national life at all levels and in all areas.

CLASS WARRIOR WRONG

This statement will not please those who for the past few years have made a hobbyhorse out of attacking the middle class. The statement is not intended in fact to refer to any particular class of society if we are talking about family origins but rather to those of all origins with the brains and aptitude to win influential positions in society. It cannot, however, exclude the middle class — as many in this category will continue to come, whether we like it or not, from that part of the nation. I am no particular partisan of the middle class myself, being continually disgusted with the cowardice and wetness that permeates so large a part of its ranks. I simply recognise that it is a class which, for better or for worse, will continue to play a major role in

the shaping of the kind of nation we are to be, and that those in politics who write it off as being of no account are simply leaving that field clear to their opponents. To 'write off' either the middle class or working class, or any of those subtle gradations in between, is sheer political stupidity — for the cause of Nationalism needs the best of them all. At the same time we must recognise that the middle class represents an expanding section of the population — something with which the trade unions have long ago come to terms, as can be seen by their strenuous efforts in recent years to mobilise those engaged in white collar occupations.

Leaving aside class considerations, I am anyway concerned to see that Nationalism in the years ahead attracts a generally better quality of average recruit. In the 1970s some of the very best of the British people joined us. At the same time I must be brutally frank in saying that we also attracted some of the absolute scum of the earth. In due course many of the first were driven out of the ranks of active Nationalism by their revulsion at the second. This is perhaps not to their credit, as it could be said that they should have stayed and fought against the harmful influence of the undesirable elements that had penetrated the movement. In the future at any rate I am determined that we will not again suffer from the tendency of the bad to drive out the good. Nationalism can survive the stigma of being labelled politically 'extreme' — a stigma that it could not anyway avoid if it tried. It cannot survive the stigma of being personified by the kind of human flotsam and jetsam that has tended recently to come to the fore in certain Nationalist factions.

Of course we always have to contend with the problem that the higher the calibre of our followers the more they are likely to be engaged in 'sensitive' occupations where they are liable to be victimised as a result of their political connections. In the Seventies this resulted in many of our most talented members being unavailable for duty in the 'front line' of political action, where they were likely to be seen and marked down. Unfortunately, the scope and range of our activities during this period was of such limits that those who could not afford to be in this 'front line' could find little other useful role, and as a result often lost interest and dropped out. I believe that in the future we must greatly extend this scope and range so that it can accommodate those who have to maintain a low profile and employ their talents to good effect.

EDUCATING THE EDUCATORS

To summarise, we have a vast undertaking in front of us to educate the British public. In the first phase of this undertaking we have to recruit and train those whose task it will be to perform the educating. One

Contd. on next page

recruit who can use his or her influence to win twenty more recruits is worth ten who could not influence anybody or anything.

It is now appropriate to consider the other aspect of our role in the 1980s, that of a business enterprise able to generate the economic and financial strength vital for the building of an effective political machine.

Let us straightforwardly base our projections, not on the possibility — at present purely hypothetical — that we may win the support of certain persons or interests of great wealth, but upon a reasonable assessment of what our money-raising capacities are likely to be, given what we achieved in this regard in the previous decade.

If this rule is accepted, we may expect that our income will come in the form of many one- and two-figure contributions by ordinary supporters, a modest number of three-figure contributions from those who are comfortably off though not in the league of great wealth and, finally, very occasional four-figure sums from those who might be regarded as being on the top rung of the category just referred to.

All important is the matter of how we use this money, and it is here that there must be the greatest change.

In future, large expenditures of money will have to be justified in terms of investment in solid capital assets. As I have indicated in a previous article, the most important of these will be properties located in the key areas of party activity throughout the country which will provide the necessary facilities for our political and commercial operations and for members to meet both for political and social purposes. Other important assets will be facilities of transport which will increase the mobility of party activists and equipment for printing publications of many kinds.

In the field of publications and their distribution, we really must begin to match the thorough commitment and professionalism of the left. In this regard it is my intention shortly to establish a new level of standards and performance to be reached by local units of the party in the way of buying and reselling party publications and not to tolerate any half-heartedness in aiming for these standards and performance. Every local unit must regard itself as being in the business of distributing party publications **for profit** and must mobilise the full energies of its active members to this end.

In almost every city and town of substantial size in the United Kingdom it is today possible to find a premises where one can buy the publications of the extreme left in their many varieties. Such premises may not be in the fashionable areas of these localities but they are nevertheless places which interested locals will always be able to find, and they will almost invariably be staffed by at least one individual giving his or her full working time to the enterprise.

This means in effect that in almost every locality the far left has a 'base' where

it can organise meetings, lectures, training seminars and social functions without relying on the favour of anyone else and where there is no fear that it will be thrown off the premises by landlords afraid of trouble.

Money has passed through the hands of Nationalists during the Seventies which, if not spent on over-ambitious election campaigns, could have been used to set up several of such centres around the country which would now be standing us in good stead. Even if in some cases it had proved impossible to maintain these premises permanently, at least they could have been sold at a profit and the movement thereby benefitted.

In the 1980s we must direct our financial resources to making good this deficiency. Fund-raising schemes in our branches and regions must be dedicated primarily to the acquisition of local premises and to the equipping of those premises with all the necessary implements for the conduct of a sustained political struggle.

There is another important aspect to this — the psychological aspect. Members who are recruited to the party and wish to serve it in some practical way, by giving their time as activists or their money or both, need to have their mental sights set on certain development targets, otherwise their enthusiasm will soon wane and they will drop out.

At the same time such targets must be ones which carry some practical prospect of realisation in the not too distant future and towards which some measure of progress can be regularly demonstrated.

Such projects as I have outlined meet this very need. They are not projects which carry only a very remote and distant chance of achievement but are ones that should be well within our capability before too long. In this way it is much more possible to maintain in our members the desired interest in the struggle and the will to work towards their objectives.

ACTIVITIES AND CAMPAIGNS

So it is also with activities and political campaigns. In the period that has passed, the only campaigns envisaged by our movement have been those aimed at securing seats in parliament, or at least in local government. But in any part of the country it is possible to find 'causes', sometimes national but more often purely local in their scope, which are in harmony with the things we stand for as a party and which can be successfully pursued by 20-30 people (or less) who are determined and know what they are about. Being seen to give a lead in these causes will not directly win us political representation, but it will gain for us much public respect which will stand us in good stead politically in the longer-term. It will also gain us many recruits among people who want to give their time to something useful which before too long can produce real results.

One such cause could be the mobilisation of members, and in time possibly some of

the local unemployed, in some useful public works. Another could be the setting up of recreational and cultural centres for White British youth. Another could be that of giving a lead in the cleaning and tidying up of the locality and the raising of funds to protect valuable local monuments and treasures. Another could be the carrying out of welfare work among the aged — usually a neglected section of the populace where do-gooder liberals are concerned, unless those aged are non-White. Another could be the mobilisation of local opposition to particularly obnoxious phenomena, such as the building of alien places of worship, welfare centres for junkies and other human dross, or simply architectural monstrosities which disfigure almost every urban landscape.

Let us in each locality consider the things we would do, or would stop being done, if we wielded political power. And then let us consider how in the present circumstances we may give examples of our intentions by organised action. Even if we are thwarted in our schemes by the power of local authorities, as is often likely to be the case, we shall at least have driven it home to the local populace what we could and would do if in office.

In this article I have only sketched the barest surface of the strategic and tactical aims that our party should set itself in the coming years — space does not permit any further elaboration here. Much of what has been said is repetitive; it has been stated more than once in previous articles in this journal over the past year or two. That is no bad thing, for repetition is sometimes necessary to break old habits of thinking and sow new ones.

What has been said in the preceding paragraph about thinking within our Nationalist movement may equally be said about thinking within the country as a whole. Never must it be forgotten that, if we are to stand some serious chance of reversing the process of national decline that has continued almost uninterrupted throughout the past half-century or more, the national thought processes of many decades must be changed. This could not be illustrated more clearly than in the reactions of many of the leading thinkers among our countrymen to the Falklands crisis. Before political power for Nationalism is even remotely conceivable, a revolution in thought and feeling within Britain is necessary. To bring about that revolution is our role, and we must never lose sight of it.

QUOTE

"These islands (the Falklands) do not have any contribution to make to our future strategy."

— Denis Healey,
Hansard, 1969

SPIRIT OF MARINES

(Contd. from page 5)

had the means to smash them to bits if that became necessary. They were the ones who should be conceding all, not Britain.

But, as we have learned repeatedly in modern times, the British politician is a totally different breed of animal to the British serviceman — and when the latter is of the kind of calibre of our crack Royal Marine Commandos the contrast becomes almost comic. When we heard of the fierce resistance of Lieutenant Mills and his men to the Argentine take-over of South Georgia, and then the magnificent sortie carried out by their comrades against Argentine installations on Pebble Island, it was hard to imagine such men belonging to the same race as these craven jellyfish running about waving their white flags before the world in the manner of whipped curs in the rain.

What must these young men, the cream of British manhood, feel as they sit in their ships or in the cockpits of their aircraft waiting for the next order to battle? What must they feel as they read in their papers about the spirit of defeatism and sell-out among most of the politicians back home? After all, it is **their** lives that are at risk. It is **their** blood that may have to be spilt if the

Falklands operation is to succeed — not the blood of Michael Foot, Tony Benn, David Steel and the rest of the whimpering crew at Westminster who daily pontificate that the all-important priority is not to sacrifice lives. The men whose lives are actually in danger accept the risk as part of the hazards of their profession and the price of their country's sovereignty and honour. It is only those oracles and scribes ensconced in their little holes in parliament and Fleet Street, far from the smoke of battle, who have the time to wring their hands over the questions of life and death.

For this is what we fear is the intention of the Thatcher Government — whatever brave postures it may currently make to safeguard its political skin. We say 'the Thatcher Government' for that is what it is. Margaret Thatcher is Prime Minister and not Mr. Pym, Lord Carrington, Willie Whitelaw or any of the rest of the soggy liberals who act as her spokesmen on foreign or home affairs. There is a myth going the rounds that they, and not she, are the ones responsible for the climate of surrender and sell-out to the nation's enemies, external and internal. But all these people are the appointees of Mrs. Thatcher herself. She put them there, and she bears ultimate responsibility for what they say and do.

Mrs. Thatcher is currently riding on the crest of a wave of national popularity on the basis of what appears superficially to be a 'firm stand' on the Falklands. That popularity will no doubt increase if the Falklands are retaken for Britain. But it will be a popularity undeserved. The whole of the credit will be due to the men down in the South Atlantic who did the job and none, absolutely none, to the politicians in the rear, who from the start have treated them as mere pawns in a revolting and disgusting political game — pawns to be moved forward, or back, as dictated by the daily requirements of political survival.

REMOTE FROM REAL WORLD

(Contd. from page 8)

Aristocratic privilege of course overlapped heavily onto the area of German military tradition, where over the centuries a very large portion of Germany's finest commanders had come from the landed gentry — particularly of Prussia. The Nazis did a great deal to institute reforms which ensured that this caste would not be exclusive, with the result that a large number of Germany's leading service chiefs in World War II came from comparatively humble background, Rommel being an outstanding example. This was not enough for National Bolsheviks like the homosexual pervert Rohm, who wanted the army to be a purely political institution with the old officer caste eliminated and only party faithfuls allowed to occupy the leading posts. Quite obviously this would be a military nonsense as well as being totally impractical from the political point of view, as it would alienate from the party a section of German society whose brains, ability and influence would be vital, first in consolidating the National Socialist regime and then in rebuilding Germany's military power. Hitler rejected the proposition out of hand, as he was bound to do.

PURGES

Stalin, on his part, took longer to come to his senses in these regards. During the 1930s he undertook widespread purges of

BETTER SUPPORT DESERVED

Those men who carry our flag with pride in the South Atlantic squalls and storms have a right to expect something better in the way of moral support from those who meanwhile enjoy the comforts of home. And they furthermore have the right to expect that if they make the supreme sacrifice to win back the Falklands for Britain, as some of them may do and are ready to do, that sacrifice will not later be rendered in vain by the wiles of Foreign Office smoothies, signing over the Falklands to alien rule and servitude on the instalment plan.

generals who, though in some cases militarily capable, were thought to be politically unreliable, and in the case of one — Marshal Tukhachevsky — was assisted by the Nazis, who planted false evidence on him for that very purpose. In the military catastrophes of 1941 and 1942; however, Stalin learned his lesson, and was forced to carry out a series of further purges, this time dismissing all those who had proven militarily incompetent and replacing them with men chosen essentially on merit shown on the battlefield. By doing this, he saved Russia's bacon just in time.

Today both categories of leaders stand condemned by the left-wingers within their own political camps, who would claim that had they, the left that is, prevailed in the factional conflicts within Communism and Nationalism, history would have taken a different, and better, course. Of course this is all pure hypothesis, as is the notion that if the principles of liberalism, peace and brotherhood were to be accepted by the whole of humanity the world would be a nicer place to live in. We will never have a chance of finding out because in the conflict between 'fact men' and men of pure ideals the 'fact men' will always prevail — as Spengler has told us repeatedly.

What left-wing Nationalists, or 'Strasserites', are fond of designating as a conflict between the 'left' and the 'right', or the 'radical' and the 'reactionary' view, of Nationalism is in reality something very different; it is a conflict between those

dwelling in the world of theoretical abstractions and those who face up to the world of real politics, which means engaging in the strategy of power. The latter will always be the winners, sometimes for the better, sometimes for the worse. The former, whether for better or worse, will always lose.

TIME TO BOMB ARGENTINA

After the Falklands article in this issue was written but just before we went to press, the appalling news was received of the destruction of HMS Ardent, HMS Antelope and HMS Coventry as a result of Argentine air attacks.

These attacks were made almost certainly from bases in Argentina itself. It is well within the tactical capability of the British task force to stage bombing raids on the bases in question but so far the Government has declined to give such an order — for purely political reasons. It is frightened of offending 'world opinion'.

We say that it is high time that the Government abandoned this kid-gloves attitude and started putting the lives of our British servicemen first. We say -- bombs on Argentina now!

WHEN British Nationalists look around and see the present depths to which our country and its people have been brought by their leaders and the forces of the ruling political establishment, it is natural for them to consider possible ways to counteract this decline.

In a recent issue of *Spearhead* one writer, Mr. Paul Chynoweth, stated that "Our immediate aim should be to give ourselves a voice in the higher levels of society," and further that it is "no good always speaking from outside the establishment. To influence it we must have a foothold in it." This infiltration of the political establishment was, according to Mr. Chynoweth, to be achieved by British Nationalism recruiting young people who are one day likely to occupy such influential positions.

The idea of an outside group infiltrating a large political organisation with the intention of influencing its actions is not new, as the Trotskyite tactic of 'entryism' of the Labour Party indicates, but that such a course of action should seriously be suggested as an "immediate aim" for British Nationalism is quite remarkable. The belief that infiltration of the political establishment in such a way as to influence its aims, ideas and actions is remotely possible for British Nationalists is staggering in its political naivete, and further, that such a course — even if possible — should be seen as desirable reveals a lack of knowledge about the workings and operation of Politics and the purpose of British Nationalism.

Mr. Chynoweth states that individuals should be recruited for British Nationalism from Sixth Forms and Universities who, having been 'won' to our cause, would, as they rise through their chosen professions within the wider political establishment, establish a 'foothold' from which they could influence that establishment! Shades of Burgess and Maclean! One can presume that Mr. Chynoweth has a role for some British Nationalist Anthony Blunt as well!

There are so many flaws in Mr. Chynoweth's view of this subject that all it is possible to do within the limited space of an article is to draw attention to some of them. The sheer size of the political establishment, of which Parliament is but a small part, reveals the impossible nature of the task proposed for Mr. Chynoweth's recruits, who, even if they could eventually reach positions of influence, would have effective control over minute areas of responsibility.

HUMAN NATURE

Mr. Chynoweth does not seem to have considered human nature and the pressures that would be continually on such recruits to conform and accept the values, beliefs and social mores of the existing political establishment. Such pressures would increase the higher the individual rose in his chosen field and in many, if not most, cases the

The role of a nationalist élite

by
ROBERT GREGORY

maxim relating to the corrupting influence of power would be likely to be fulfilled. This is especially so since it is apparently not expected that such individuals should act covertly and pass intelligence to British Nationalist Groups outside the wider establishment — a role that **would** have some practical value — but that they should be "a voice in the higher levels of society".

One wonders how long Mr. Chynoweth thinks the existing political establishment would allow such British Nationalist 'voices' to remain within the upper areas of society! If one or even several individuals **did** achieve influential positions and then acted out their role as a British Nationalist 'voice', their careers within politics, the Civil Service, the Law, Banking, Business or any other part of the wider establishment would certainly come to a painfully sudden end. It is not clear what time factor Mr. Chynoweth has in mind for his recruits to reach their influential positions — ten years, fifteen, twenty? Unfortunately, given the existing state of Britain, time is not on the side of British Nationalism.

NON-STARTER

For all the reasons stated above, as well as others, Mr. Chynoweth's idea on this subject is a non-starter, but even if it **were** possible to have individual 'voices' within the liberal-democratic political establishment would it be desirable?

One principal aim of British Nationalism is to achieve political power in order to transform Britain into a Racial-Nationalist State. Therefore the suggestion of obtaining an 'influential voice' within the **existing** political establishment in order to be able to tinker around with minor aspects of both liberal-democratic policies and institutions is not merely irrelevant but contrary to the wider aim of eliminating that system. It should not be an aim to obtain 'influence' within liberal-democratic institutions such as the BBC, the Foreign Office or *The Times*, but rather to recognise that they are responsible for the present state of our country and its people, that by their nature they are inevitably the enemies of a resurgent British Nationalism and that as such they must be effectively controlled or completely replaced.

Institutions that reflect the fundamental beliefs of Nation and Race will need to be created to carry out the policies of a Racial-Nationalist State. The Institutions of the existing liberal-democratic system and those 'higher levels of society' that staff them will not be required and should be consigned to the dustbin of history and in some cases suffer the penalty reserved for traitors. British Nationalism does not merely seek a change of government, a little adjustment of the present political system but **revolutionary change** at all levels of our society. Those institutions that have a proven worth should be retained, all else should be replaced by necessary institutions cast within the image of our beliefs.

GATHERING INTELLIGENCE

Individual British Nationalists **should** be within the wider political establishment but not seeking some imagined 'influence', which would be futile; rather they should operate covertly as gatherers of intelligence which can be utilised by active political groups. As the opposition faced by British Nationalism is so strong, it is vital that information from within can be gathered and used in the best possible way.

British Nationalism should possess the rudiments of a patriotic ruling *élite* but should not hope to get one from recruits to our cause within the professions exercising some imaginary 'influence' inside the existing political establishment. As Nationalists we have to accept that we live under a liberal-democratic state and a political system that is repugnant to us and which we seek to replace. It should be our task to **use** that system in order to help achieve its eventual destruction but we must never become a part of that system and fall under its corrupting influence. British Nationalism should become the **alternative** to liberal-democracy, compelled to operate within the present political system but never becoming a part of it. Racial-Nationalism is a revolutionary movement that can never compromise with Parliamentary liberal-democracy, which has betrayed both our nation and our race and is dedicated to the eventual extinction of both! Attempts to obtain some imagined form of 'influence' within the present political establishment are not only irrelevant to the massive struggle upon which we are engaged but are positively dangerous, as at best they confuse our efforts and at worst can corrupt, and in some cases destroy, the essence of belief in British Nationalism.

The battle for our country and our race is not a skirmish that can be settled by compromise nor won by some imaginary 'influence'; it is a war that must end in victory or defeat and in which any form of association with the detested liberal-democracy would itself be an odious form of treason.

PAUL THOMAS

THE QUIET DEATH OF INTEGRATION

IN THE NINETEEN SIXTIES the objective of all liberal whites in Britain was to achieve "integration" between the white indigenous inhabitants and the coloured aliens who had come pouring in. The word 'integration' first came into prominence in this context in America with the 'civil rights' movement and was quickly used by liberals in this country. This was despite the status of the coloured population in Britain — as recent immigrants — being considerably different from that of the negro in America, where some are descendants of those who have lived there for centuries.

Since the formation of the Race Relations Industry by the obnoxious Wilson administration in the late nineteen sixties, millions of pounds of the taxpayers' money has been squandered to try and bring about integration. Every liberal's dream was to create a society with blacks, browns and whites living in peace and harmony with each other and where discrimination had been eradicated. Racial miscegenation would be freely practised so that, in future centuries, the world would be populated by one, coffee-coloured race.

More than a decade has passed since then and we are no further achieving racial harmony than ever. In fact, it appears that the ideal of integration has been quietly dropped by the liberals, who once desired it so fanatically. For some years a new term has been used to describe what they want — they now say that we are living in a "multi-racial and multi-cultural society". This expression is very different from the word 'integration' which implies the complete blending of all races with each other. 'Multi-cultural' implies that all the different races will not necessarily come together in a huge melting pot but will remain in separate ethnic groups, although living together in the same land harmoniously.

DREAMS THWARTED

This proves that the naive dreams of the liberals of over a decade ago have not come to fruition and they are now seeking new ways of achieving "racial harmony". It is true that there have been a number of mixed marriages — usually involving white females of low morals — but there haven't been **that** many.

To emphasise the failure of integration let us compare the immigrant



YOUNG BLACKS IN BRITAIN

They represent a totally different culture and way of life

communities of twenty five years ago — when they first started flooding in — with these same communities today.

A quarter of a century ago West Indians were a fairly conventional crowd. They dressed not much differently to the whites and their speech was understandable despite their marked accents. The most noticeable difference was the colour of their skins but there were others — their music, religious fervour (albeit Christian) and a tendency in many toward certain crime and vices.

In the nineteen eighties the West Indian community are very different. Their leaders are arrogant, smartly dressed demagogues; their hair styles and styles of dress, especially in the younger generation, are totally alien; they have established strange religious cults; their music has developed its own way — although with some white influence — and their speech is unintelligible other than the Anglo-Saxon obscenities some of them use so frequently. The West Indians are not an integrated community; they are a foreign tribe in Britain.

Asian immigrants have always been aloof from the rest of the community.

This is largely because of their religion, which lays down strict rules for the way they have to dress and for their devotions. Making them even more unassimilable are their languages which have provided countless difficulties and, in recent years, expense for officialdom. Their habits and way of life have always been at variance with the rest of the community.

MOSQUES AND TEMPLES

When they first arrived their religious gatherings were held in private houses in the suburbs of cities where they settled. They are now, however, erecting mosques and temples in every part of the country where there is a strong Muslim, Hindu or Sikh community. Sikhs have been granted special privileges to wear turbans; leaders of the various Asian communities are demanding that their alien religions should be taught in schools alongside with the Christian religion; after years of education, local authorities are still forced to spend thousands of pounds of the ratepayers' money in printing multilingual literature for their Asian com-

Contd. on next page



Integration collapses: Blacks riot in Brixton, 1981

munities. Asian immigrants haven't simply rejected our society; they are asserting themselves and their voices are becoming even more insistent.

FAILURE OF RACE INDUSTRY

The failure of the Race Relations Industry to achieve 'integration' and racial harmony is not only because of white opposition but because the industry allows the immigrant communities to spend the funds allocated to them in the way they want, which is inevitably to enable them to lead their own way of life. It is possible that the funds allocated to the Race Relations Industry were originally intended to be used to make them become more 'British', but this objective has long since been abandoned.

In the future the immigrant communities are likely to become even more exclusive and nationalistic. We are likely to see special private schools set up for Muslims and Rastas, housing associations building blocks of flats for the exclusive use of members of an alien community and property purchased for the sole use of foreign groups and cult activities. As a result of Government handouts and subsidies the immigrant communities — especially the Asian ones — have become very wealthy. In years to come we could even see semi-official assemblies set up promulgating laws for the alien communities which will be automatically ratified by Parliament.

The tacit admission of the failure of

integration indicates that the liberals have been proved wrong. Their ideas of Britain as a 'multi-cultural society' will also prove them wrong, for the more arrogant and the more exclusive the alien tribes become the more friction there will be between themselves and the whites.

White British Nationalists should make the maximum effort to show how increasingly different the immigrant communities are becoming. This is proving more and more that we have been right in

predicting that Britain would become an Afro-Asian slum. We should point out the vast sums of money the immigrant communities have at their disposal to spend on building their places of worship and ask why they are still given sums of money from the taxpayer and ratepayer to provide them with English language tuition. We now have facts at our disposal to show that immigrant communities are going to become even more demanding as to their 'rights' in the future.

How to obtain SPEARHEAD

Spearhead is available from our office to those who wish to ensure obtaining copies for themselves every month and to those who wish to obtain quantities for redistribution.

Those wishing for copies for themselves each month should take out a subscription by filling in the form below and sending it to us with a cheque or postal order for the amount applicable.

NAME

ADDRESS

The following rates are for 12 issues (please tick in box where applicable):—

British Isles: £6.15 Overseas unsealed surface mail: £6.60 Overseas sealed surface mail: £8.55

Unsealed air-mail Middle East: £9.50 Unsealed air-mail Canada, U.S.A., South America and


Africa: £11.10 Unsealed air-mail Australia, New Zealand, Far East: £12.00

Please note: These overseas rates apply if remittance is in Pounds Sterling; if remittance is in overseas currency an additional charge of £2 applies, as our bankers require this as commission for the handling of all foreign cheques.

Discounts for bulk purchases can be obtained as follows:—

10-19 copies: 28p ea.; 20-49 copies: 25p ea.; 50-99 copies: 21p ea.; 100-199 copies: 18p ea.; 200-499 copies: 15p ea.; 500 copies or over: 14p ea. (For advice on postal rates, please contact our office).

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *Spearhead* and sent to: Seacroft, Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.



The Editor,
Spearhead,
Seaford,
Westbourne Villas,
HOVE, SUSSEX.

Letters

SIR: Your analysis of the Falklands issue last month was right on the mark. The jellyfish attitude of our politicians towards our responsibilities to the loyal British subjects of the Falklands, and towards the aggression of Argentina, is truly depressing to behold.

President Galtieri may not have troops of the calibre of our Royal Marines, Paratroopers or SAS but he has the priceless advantage of several extra divisions that we do not have -- in the form of a huge fifth column in his enemy's camp.

A. R. WALKER
Birmingham

SIR: It is quite incredible how many journalists and politicians of the Right, who normally show good judgement of political matters, are now delivering accolades to Mrs. Thatcher for what they call 'firm leadership' in the Falklands crisis and blaming any Government flabbiness on Mr. Francis Pym, and Lord Carrington before him.

The fact is that both Pym and Carrington, as well as other wets like Willie Whitelaw, were appointed to their posts by Mrs. Thatcher and could be dismissed by her at any time she chose.

Mrs. Thatcher chose a War Cabinet of five to preside over the Falklands business. One of these was her poodle, Cecil Parkinson; another was Defence Minister Nott, who comes across on television rather like a cold rice pudding. The other two were arch-wets Whitelaw and Pym. It is said that she chose Parkinson and Nott because they would be likely to support her policies in the crisis and thereby allow her to prevail in a majority of three to two against the wets.

But she did not have to appoint the two wets in the first place. This does not seem like the action of an 'Iron Lady'.

And if the compromising statements made by Pym in the last two or three weeks concerning the possibility of a long-term agreement to hand over the Falklands to

Argentina did not carry the support of Mrs. Thatcher, why did she not stand up publicly and say so?

T. B. POTTER
Welwyn, Herts

SIR: Somehow I cannot find it within me to hate General Galtieri and his Junta. We must throw them out of the Falklands of course because those islands are our territory and their people British. But when all this is said and done Galtieri and his Government are Nationalists acting in accordance with what they believe is right for their country. Throughout this affair, they have shown a firm stand on principles and at no point have given any hint that those principles -- the principles of Argentine sovereignty over the Falklands -- are in any way negotiable. Despite great military setbacks, they have not deviated from this position. Galtieri has been condemned by some of our 'liberal' journalists for saying that he is prepared to sacrifice 4,000 or even 40,000 lives in defence of Argentine sovereignty over the islands, but given that that cause is a right and just one from the Argentine point of view (though not of course from our own) that is a perfectly admissible statement to make. I am only sorry that more of our politicians and pen-pushers do not think the same way.

By contrast with Galtieri and Co., the pussyfooting and equivocating of our own 'leaders' has been quite pathetic.

K. MARNHAM
Upminster, Essex

SIR: Much though we may lament the unwillingness of some nations to apply sanctions against Argentina as a consequence of the Falklands invasion, is it not a fact that (1) sanctions are a cowardly and sneaky way of dealing with an international adversary -- except when one is prepared at the same time to use force, which no-one except Britain is, and (2) they have never been very effective anyway.

Britain certainly should not have gone pleading either to the Common Market or to the United States to get sanctions imposed; the quarrel with Argentina is our quarrel and not anyone else's. They taught me at school that it was the manly custom to settle one's own quarrels with one's own fists and not to go whining to others to get help. That is good advice, which is applicable not only to individuals but to nations.

C. J. L. DARKE
Farnham, Surrey

SIR: If Britain comes out on top in the Falklands conflict, it will not be due, as some might imagine, to the superiority of our national leadership or political institutions but solely to the better calibre of our

armed forces. Nearly half the Argentines are of Italian descent and we know from much experience, both as the allies and enemies of the Italians, what that race is worth in fighting terms. There is a joke, though possibly apocryphal nevertheless based on a great deal of reality, which says that when Italy entered the war in 1940 and Hitler was informed he said: "Dispatch two divisions." On being told "No, Mein Führer, not on the other side but on our side," he changed the order and said: "In that case dispatch ten divisions!"

There is of course the Spanish half in the Argentine population -- plus a stiffening of about a million people of German descent. These elements by tradition can fight. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the Argentine forces are mainly conscripted and vastly inferior in professionalism and training to our own.

It is for these reasons that an eventual British victory is likely. Our great mistake, however, may then be that we attribute such a victory to the superior virtues of 'democracy', just as we did at the conclusion of World War II, which, despite the might of what was then the British Empire, we would have lost had we not had the other two world's biggest powers on our side.

In fact 'democracy' has in the Falklands conflict, as in others before it, shown itself to be pretty feeble. It left our forces insufficiently manned and equipped in the Falklands, as everywhere else, to begin with. Since the opening of the conflict it has failed to give them the moral backing they deserve in terms of a united political leadership at home. It has tolerated the existence of national broadcasting services which seem sometimes to be more on the Argentine side than the British side and which have served as one of General Galtieri's best propaganda weapons.

With such friends, the commanders of our forces in the South Atlantic might well ask: who needs enemies?

If we draw the correct lessons from the Falklands affair, we should recognise (1) that the British fighting man is still second to none in the world; and (2) that our political institutions are totally rotten and corrupt and must be changed if Britain is to survive.

B. T. KENT
Preston, Lancs

SIR: Why the hell does the Ministry of Defence appoint as its spokesman to read us its daily bulletins from the Falklands a character who looks more like an undertaker's clerk and has a voice to match. We should be presented with some military figure with a strong presence that inspires confidence and hope.

S. DOBBS
Aberdeen

Media Jews behind race-mix poison

by
G. T. GULTONE

SPEARHEAD's March issue illustrated David Bell's analysis of television corruption with a front-page photo of a 'dance group' calling itself *Hot Gossip*.

Among all the examples of racial, sexual and cultural sewage that have accompanied the sinking of Great Britain, this particular one repays close study.

The anti-nationalist rag *Searchlight* back in April 1979 described *HG* as "one of Britain's top pop groups". Its mixed-race members "have appeared often on television and had a hit with their record *Starship Trooper*. They have recently been appearing on the Kenny Everett show which has come under fire from Mrs. Whitehouse's organisation. The group's choreographer is Jewish . . .".

This person, Arlene Phillips, told *The Sun* that when she first formed *HG*, "they were rejected by every TV station in Britain" (3rd April 1980). She was advised not to send out any more pictures of "black guys leaning on white girls". She admitted to the *Evening Standard*: "I deliberately use really young girls because people love to watch them so much" (1st May 1979).

One girl member did not recommend the "torrid stage style" for personal relationships (*Sun*, 8th May 1979). This was correctly described as "being too suggestive" and "coming on too strong". Few press reports have attempted to conceal the pornographic function of *HG* performances, which blatantly cater for the fantasies of male self-abuse, not quite what Lord Reith had in mind for British broadcasting.

One Robin Katz explained that Phillips had started out with a similarly "suggestive act" for a TV advert that "featured high-fashion models touting seamless underwear with such a lewd come-on that it took ages . . . to work out just what was being sold" (*Daily Mail*, 12th August 1978). "Now Phillips and *Hot Gossip* have a stream of bookings, and nothing is bizarre enough."

Mr. Katz laughed at the "precious idea" that *HG* are "offensive because they are exposed to kids at teatime", and hastened to assure readers that Phillips wasn't being "deliberately" dirty — even when "shades of sado-masochism" appear in a black dancer kicking a white female on the floor. Yet he used the terminology of striptease in describing their "overtly sexual" acts and their "soft porn style" which TV viewers "have been lapping up".

STAPLE DIET

Not many years ago exactly similar actions even in a private theatre would have met with the attentions of the police vice squad. Now the filth floods into the living-room as a staple diet for British children to the accompaniment of black rock music.

The main boost for *HG* came from the Kenny Everett show, which trades in lunacy and smut even more than the average modern TV 'comedy' show, and that's bad enough. One of his characters, known as 'Sid Snot', has been

accused of encouraging school-children to indulge in vandalism and crude language. His wife told the *Daily Mail* (12th April 1980) that Kenny was never attracted by girls until he met her. "He liked musclemen — the sort of man he would like to have been . . . But we are fed up with gossip column articles written in a snide way which keep suggesting he is gay."

The *Mail* commented that if Kenny's "sexual confusion" had been as pronounced as his wife suggested, "it is ironic that his show is without doubt the most sexually provocative on TV. *Hot Gossip*, the dance group that he made stars of, have constantly been at the centre of controversy over the explicitness of their choreography."

It is not necessary to have been a member of the nowadays cynical Obscene Publications Squad to know what 'explicitness' means!

Mr. Everett in a recent appearance spent some time clutching his private parts and, after a particularly lascivious display by *HG* on his earlier 'Video Show', actually made a remark to the effect that the experience had given him an erection. The purpose of the "naughty bits" for some male viewers is clearly indistinguishable from the video-cassettes, literary trash, dirty photographs and mechanical aids available from the 'sex-shops', whose proliferation has still not been curbed by parliamentary action.

It is a mistake to suppose that *HG* is merely tastefully erotic or that it caters to "soft-core" fantasies in lyrics, music, movements, themes or "costume" (such as it is). Quite apart from the racial aspect, the ideas are usually taken quite heavily from the outer reaches of hard-core porn and prostitution. Fetishism and sadism are favourites with *HG*.

An early admirer, Clive James, TV critic for the *Observer*, eventually complained that the "eroticism is no more attractive than an cinema" (30th March 1980), and took exception (admittedly on anti-Nazi rather than pro-Nazi grounds) to the "supposedly dramatic appearance" of "black male dancers" dressed as "SS officers" and to the girls reacting "with suitable writhings of submissive lust".

Why pay for a seat in a Soho peep-shop, one may well ask, when the nation can masturbate itself into oblivion at home for nothing?

After all, the habit has spread, from the Marti Caine chorus girls to the Foxy Feeling dancers, who appeared "in little more than black stockings and suspenders, miming to the Donne Summer lament to a prostitute" (*Daily Mail*, 15th March 1980). Even explicitly children's TV gets this kind of stuff — not so long ago one nearly-naked singing-group appeared, wriggling in front of primary-school age children, telling us how when "they got home, they took off all their clothes, and made love on the phone". Protests were a waste of time. Payola was what mattered.

TV critic Russell Davies described Benny Hill's 'Angels' as the 'crack squad' of the "masturbatory beyond" which TV now provides the British people (*Sunday Times*, 9th March 1980). And Arlene Phillips, who largely started it all, affected disgust herself: "I am quite

shocked by some of the things I see on TV." Too many dancers were deliberately 'suggestive' and Benny Hill's girls belong more in a Soho show than on "a prime time family programme . . . They pose, barely clad, in unbelievable positions."

Benny Hill admitted: "It's true they're often in leather and plastic, and the routines are a little bit lesbian . . . But it's like that all over nowadays. You'd be amazed at what you can see and hear on television at 2.30 in the afternoon. Topless birds. Beauty queens telling how much they want to get screwed." (*Sunday Times*, 2nd March 1980).

In 1980 Oxford graduates, researching for Mrs. Whitehouse's decency organisation, found that nearly 40 per-cent of "sex, violence and vulgarity" appeared on screen before children were in bed (*Sun*, 14th March 1980). ITV came top on the "offensive material" ratings. Things have steadily got far worse since then, particularly with some of the content of programmes like *OTT* and *Not the Nine O'Clock News*. Porno routines on variety shows and disco programmes are common.

RACIAL AND SEXUAL FILTH

What makes *HG* particularly repulsive, of course, is the addition of racial promiscuity to sexual perversion. The "naughty bits" for "teatime viewing" emphasise the idea of black/white sexual encounter, with the black men usually dominating the white girls.

From Lambeth to Leyton it is nowadays a deplorably common sight to see white girls not with white boyfriends but with blacks. Negro males tend to "take-over" local youth clubs, and make a bee-line for blondes. Their dancing skills and sexual promiscuity appeal to some white girls who find spotty youths of their own race somewhat emasculated by comparison.

The compulsory 'multi-racial' society has resulted in the "multi-cultural comprehensive" in our main urban areas, and these usually have regular school-discos, where the mixed-race ethos is as fashionable as the pop-lyrics and rhythms are pornographic. In that climate, *Hot Gossip* has set the most dangerous model-example for national decadence.

The muscular rhythms of the average adolescent black are reinforced by greater quantities of testosterone in the glands — hence the mugging problem, incidentally — but are not compensated by the development of the supragranular layer of their brains. The resultant sexual irresponsibility means more half-caste bastards for British girls.

Sexual promiscuity is the open-door to racial suicide. If Britain is turned into a pig-swill hodge-podge of coffee-coloured half-wits, high on dope and low on morals, ruined by a huge violent crime rate and the complete breakdown of the Anglo-Saxon family structure, then among the many people whom we shall know to thank will be Arlene Phillips and her TV promoters.

New local units set up

NEW LOCAL UNITS of the British National Party have been springing up at a fast pace over the past month, showing the steady growth of the party.



RAY HILL

STICKERS

BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY stickers are now available in the following varieties:

- 'Join the British National Party'
- 'Stop immigration - start repatriation'
- 'British jobs for British workers'
- 'Keep the Falkland Islands British'
- 'Keep the Falklands oil British'
- 'Repatriation now'
- 'Nuclear free - a subversive fraud' (anti-CND)
- 'Stamp out vermin' (anti-communist, showing rat with hammer and sickle).

All the stickers are illustrated and cost 70p per 100 (inc. postage). Order from: BNP Surrey Group, c/o Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB.

At a meeting of activists on May 24th plans were made to set up a Hackney group. This will be established immediately, with a formal meeting of the group to take place on June 2nd. Plans are also afoot to set up a group very soon afterwards in Tower Hamlets, an area of London adjacent to Hackney where there are also signs of much support. Hackney was one of the great strongholds of Nationalism in the 1970s and it is heart-warming to see activity once again in swing there.


The meeting on May 24th resulted in many London ex-members of British Movement opting to join the BNP. This influx is very largely due to the work of Ray Hill and Eddy Morrison.

Eddy Morrison has also been instrumental in establishing a new group of the party in Croydon, where previously there was none.

Down in Surrey a local group has also been established as a result of a long series of negotiations between the party National Organiser Charles Parker and local Nationalists. The group will start with cells in Leatherhead, Dorking and Redhill.

work of Paul Thomas.

We have also recently heard from North Devon, where a group of Nationalists led by Ralph Dodd is setting up as a local unit of the party.



CHARLES PARKER

PERSEVERING

Things are at last stirring in Bristol and a group in the city is now being set up officially. For this we must thank the persevering

AREA REPORTS

BOURNEMOUTH

JOHN TYNDALL, BNP Leader, made a visit to Bournemouth on May 27th and spoke to a meeting of the local group there. Mr. Tyndall spoke of the Falkland Islands crisis and condemned the lack of firmness of the Government in defending the islanders, then showing preparedness to bargain over their future.

PLYMOUTH

ON MAY 29th, John Tyndall visited Plymouth, a BNP stronghold, and spoke at a very well attended meeting of the local branch. Referring again to the Falklands, he contrasted the fine fighting spirit of the British forces to the flabbiness of our political leaders. Many new applications for membership were received after the meeting.

CHELTONHAM AND GLOUCESTER

LOCAL BNP Organiser Robert Rhodes was recently interviewed on the TV programme 'Points West' following the distribution of the leaflet *How to Spot a Red Teacher* by BNP activists in Cheltenham and Gloucester schools. Mr. Rhodes has also created a great deal of additional publicity for the Party by means of numerous letters which have been published in several local newspapers.

LEAGUE REVIEW

For a new view on human affairs read *League Review*, journal of the League of St. George. This is a 24-page pictorial magazine costing 45p. Subscription rate is £5 for 8 issues (British Isles). For sample send 60p to: *League Review*, 9/11 Kensington High Street, London W8 5NP.

All patriots should read

CANDOUR

The British Views Letter

founded by

A. K. Chesterton

Published by Candour Publishing Co.
Forest House, Liss Forest, Hants.

Read NEW FRONTIER Voice of the New National Front

You can obtain single copies of *New Frontier* by paying a subscription of £3.40 for 12 issues (for subscribers in the British Isles). For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail).

If you wish to obtain *New Frontier* in bulk for redistribution, the rates are:-

10 copies	£1.20	+ 32p post
25 copies	£2.70	+ 94p post
50 copies	£4.80	+ £1.57 post
100 copies	£8.40	+ £1.90 post
150 copies	£11.70	+ £2.10 post
200 copies	£14.40	+ £2.25 post
300 copies	£19.80	+ £2.55 post
400 copies	£24.00	+ £2.80 post
500 copies	£29.40) Bulk rates
1,000 copies	£55.20) by roadline

All cheques or postal orders should be made out to *New Frontier*, PO Box 115, Hove, E. Sussex BN3 3SB. Please keep orders and enquiries for *New Frontier* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

Emergency appeal

LATEST REPORT

A VERY FINE RESPONSE has been made by our readers to the special emergency appeal made in a circular posted with the April issue to assist in helping the Editor of Spearhead avoid bankruptcy.

The circumstances of the bankruptcy threat were that the Editor had a judgement awarded against him in the courts in January 1980 for having breached an injunction previously served upon him to admit certain persons to Excalibur House in London whom he had on an earlier occasion ordered to be barred from the building. This was when he was acting as Chairman of the National Front and carrying out a directive made by the National Directorate of the party that those persons be denied entry into the build-

ing on grounds of good order and security.

The persons concerned were supporters of the disloyal faction within the party headed by Mr. Andrew Fountaine and Mr. Paul Kavanagh which later came to be known as the 'Constitutional Movement'.

The court, in awarding against our Editor, ordered him to pay the costs of the case which were estimated at £6,414.64. Although this liability was rightly that of the National Front, on whose behalf our Editor was only acting as agent, the Directorate of the NF refused to accept the liability and left our Editor to fend for himself. Our appeal in April was to readers to help him raise the necessary money.

As a result of the appeal, a total sum

has so far been pledged in support which has enabled the Editor to make a settlement offer to the plaintiffs in the action. As we go to press, it is not yet known what the response to this offer is.

At a later date we will, as we have promised, give official acknowledgements to all those who have contributed or pledged money by detailing the sums concerned together with the initials and area of the donor.

In the meantime we should like to convey our deepest thanks to all those readers who have committed themselves to help our Editor raise the necessary money.

As was to be expected, the generosity of the response to this appeal has meant that readers have had less money available to send to the ordinary Spearhead Fund, and as a result the money coming into the latter fund over the past two months has greatly decreased. This has created some temporary difficulties which we hope may be overcome as a result of increased contributions in the near future.

NORTH NEWS

BNP National Organiser Charles Parker spoke at a meeting of the party's Gateshead Branch on the 25th May. The meeting ended in great enthusiasm and a fine collection raised £53. New membership applications have been received since the meeting.

Shortly previously, Mr. Parker had spoken at a meeting of North Western party officials at Liverpool and had discussed new plans for the organisation of the party in the region.

Liverpool will also be visited by BNP Leader John Tyndall on June 7th for the purpose of addressing local activists on the subject of future party activities in the area.

Congratulations!

SPEARHEAD offers its congratulations to Leicester BNP activists Ian and Jenny Gilford, who recently announced the birth of a son, Shaun, who arrived on April 24th.

COOKING FIGURES

NATIONAL FRONT HEAD OFFICE seems to have been taking some tips of instruction from President Galtieri's propaganda ministry - or could it be the other way round?

In the May issue of National Front News it is reported that 800 party activists attended the party's St. George's Day march in Blackpool.

We have received two eye-witness reports of the march, and both testified that the numbers were between 300 and 400.

March in Worcester on June 26th!

MIDLANDS REGION of the British National Party will be holding a march through the city of Worcester on Saturday, June 26th, in the afternoon.

The march will be a protest of Nationalist youth against the high rate of unemployment among young people. Nationalists of all age groups, however, will be taking part.

The march has been organised in the city mainly on the initiative of BNP Worcester Organiser Mark Cotterill. It will be supported mainly by Midlands members but members from other parts of the country will be welcome to attend if they can.

Will any readers interested in taking part in the march please contact National Activities Organiser David Bruce for details by ringing 01 807 7621.

SPEARHEAD FUND

Spearhead, in this difficult period for British Nationalism, has only been kept alive by the loyalty of its most steadfast readers and by the generosity of particular supporters who have made sacrifices from out of their own pockets to help us continue in print.

Many former readers have felt unable to renew their subscriptions because of unemployment and the consequent need for financial economies. We have also had to sustain considerable losses in bulk sales as a result of the present division among British Nationalist groups.

These factors have made us all the more dependent upon the donations we can obtain from our small circle of committed loyalists. We can only ask that those in this circle maintain their contributions in the coming months and that others who have not previously donated beyond paying the bare price of their copies now try to do so. This is essential if we are to continue in publication.

We remind all those making financial contributions that it is not our custom to send receipts automatically except for sums of £10 or over. This is in order to save the time of our office staff and economise on postage. If, however, any donor of less than £10 should desire confirmation that their donation has been received, would they please enclose an S.A.E. with the donation.

All contributions should be sent to Spearhead, 52 Westbourne Villas, Hove, Sussex.

Subversion of the faith

Ecumenical Soup (by Bernard Smith). From: C.A.S., 30 Clifton Road, Worthing, W. Sussex. 44p for one copy (inc. postage), £1 for three copies (inc. postage).

It is becoming increasingly obvious that Christianity is being sacrificed on the altar of politics, expediency and social convenience. The One Worlders are using the churches to bring about the unity and equality of all faiths, and now that we are living in a multi-racial society, which has been thrust upon us without our consent, we are told from the pulpit and by the media that all religions, as well as all races, are equal.

In recent years this craze for unifying and equalising has been making rapid progress among Catholics and Protestants alike. Bernard Smith, the Secretary of The Christian Affirmation Campaign, has just published a booklet entitled *Ecumenical Soup* which I have no hesitation in recommending to those who wish to learn more of the subtle attempts to destroy our Christian faith.

This booklet exposes the man-made religion of multi-faiths which are listed under the heading 'Ecumenicalism'.

Now, it seems, we have reached the stage in the progress towards unity and equality where Christian Missionaries are no longer required; in fact they are being discouraged both at home and abroad — especially at home. Our leaders evidently feel that if Christianity were to be preached in a Christian country it might prove, among other things, that some religions are more equal than others. And that would never do in an egalitarian society. This might also prove to be a crime similar to Racism, or racial discrimination, and could possibly be punishable by law!

But Christ Himself said:— "I am the way, the truth and the life; no man cometh

Review by SUE EVELYN

**THE
ARCHBISHOP
OF
CANTERBURY**
A keen promoter
of the
Ecumenical
Movement



unto the Father but by me" (*John 14:6*). No wonder He was crucified.

The Bible clearly teaches us to discriminate against other faiths. Today's other faiths are mainly Buddhism, Bahaiism, Hinduism, Judaism, Mohammedism, Sikhism and Communism, as well as all the other new religions which emerge almost daily.

The current view among our leaders is that as Christianity discriminates against other faiths it must no longer be preached. Instead the gospel of unity and equality is to be superimposed on the Christian faith, with a flavour of all other existing religions, thus creating a mixed ecumenical soup in which no individual flavour is distinguishable.

Most people are led to believe that 'Ecumenicalism' means tolerance and

brotherly love towards those of other faiths, but in practice it results in the destruction of Christianity and the betrayal of our Lord and Saviour.

Our present Church Leaders are false latterday prophets; there is nothing new about them. We were warned of them in the following verse from St. Matthew's gospel, which is more than apt today: "Beware of false prophets which come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves" (*Matthew 7:15*).

Bernard Smith leaves us in no doubt that the Ecumenical Movement is not a religious exercise but a major part of Marxist psychological warfare aimed at destroying the Christian faith by stealth in preparation for the take-over of the Western World.

Find out about the British National Party

Send 20p for information pack.

To:
P.O. BOX 115
HOVE
E. SUSSEX BN3 3SB
(Tel. 0273 777540)

Name.....

Address.....

I enclose